



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	10 th September 2014
Time	10:00
Location	Grafton House
Invited	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) James Cutting (SCC) (JC) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Arwel Owen (DLA) (AO) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD)
Distribution	Attendees only
Apologies	Nicolle Philips (NP); Eddie Peters (EP);

Items:

			Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting		Attached
1.1	ML went through the actions from the last meeting.		
1.2	Action 5.14 KD to send IBC 'Swindon' design code.		
1.3	Action 5.15 JC has brought a secondary school delivery timetable to discuss. Item 3.		
1.4	Action 6.3 SM/RC to confirm Network Rail details that are		


1.5 1.6	<p>in the public domain.</p> <p>Action 6.4 Michael Newsham – (IBC Integrated Transport Officer) to organize a meeting with Network Rail.</p> <p>Action 8.6 DCLG to announce successful capacity funding bids later this month.</p>		
2.0 2.1 2.2	<p>Update on CBRE / Mersea planning application</p> <p>RC explained that the formal consultation period for the application has now closed, and that over 500 objections had been received. Crest has sent a holding objection, as had the NHS. Network Rail had asked for a meeting. Other comments of note received are from Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Mid Suffolk DC and Anglian Water. Comments were still due from SCC and Natural England amongst others. When available relevant internal consultee comments would be put on the IBC website.</p> <p>JC – SCC application may need to go to Cabinet (5th Nov) with the report being available 2/3 wks before.</p>		
3.0 3.1 3.2 3.3	<p>Discussion on IDP submitted with CBRE / Mersea application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from IBC / SCC / Crest / Ipswich School • Timetable for formal submission of comments • Summary of main issues arising • Agree next steps for resolution <p>RC felt that the IDP was a positive basis for ongoing discussions which takes account of IDP advice and SPD. However concerned that it did not present a joined up approach between landowners nor provided any detail on how strategic infrastructure items would actually be delivered. Particular issues relating to ransom strips, secondary school, rail bridge and country park do not appear to have been considered in enough detail. Also the delivery rate assumptions are different to those assumed in SPD, and raises question as to whether this accords with other landowners / developers intentions and what implications this has for infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>KD was unclear how the IDP might be used in its current form, particularly as the IDP had no infrastructure costs in it. Also how the IDP would be updated over time was an important issue that needed addressing, as was the utilities delivery throughout the lifetime of the project. KD stated that Crest wanted a collaborative approach to the delivery of infrastructure, but queried whether IBC had other ways to deliver.</p> <p>AO made the point that IDP strategy for utilities came straight from the industry after discussions with them.</p>		

3.4	KD did feel that the IDP was a good starting point. FL said the IDP was a key trigger to how shared infrastructure would be delivered. The IDP should be a robust, outward facing document which is underpinned by an agreement by landowners/developers of some sort to secure delivery.		
3.5	KD felt that a s.106 may be a way forward for the delivery of the strategic infrastructure. A general discussion was had about s.106 rather than an IDP for infrastructure. JC felt that a joint s.106 agreement between the landowners and SCC could well deliver the secondary school.		
3.6	ML felt that it was disappointing that after numerous meetings an agreement in the form of an IDP had not been reached. SM stated that the SPD requires that an IDP would need to be agreed. AO felt that the responsibility should not just sit with the developers, but that IBC/SCC should co-ordinate the delivery.		
3.7	RC commented that the IDP needed to be taken forward by having focused discussion on particular infrastructure items such as Rail bridge, Country Park and Secondary School in order to ascertain the detailed stages of delivery, timings, costings and what the specific issues are which need to be overcome.		
3.8	Brief discussion about the Crest site, KD felt that Crest might make an application in April 2015.		
3.9	FL said that the SPD had been conceived as a comprehensive development, and that there would be lots of benefits from this approach, particularly to long term land values. The spirit of the SPD needed to be retained. SC felt the document was useful but needed to be taken forward.		
3.10	SM said that IBC was waiting for the final consultation comments, before adopting a position on the application, which should happen by 5 th November.		
3.11	ML concluded that there was more work to be done on the IDP.		
3.12	Action: KD to forward to IBC details about when Crest originally got interest in the NF land.		
3.13	JC introduced a Secondary School Delivery note prepared by SCC, and explained how the housing delivery rates at the NF would determine when delivery of a secondary school would be required. Looking at the table supplied and based on delivery assumptions from the IDP a school would be required to open in 2021. Working back this would therefore require transfer of land in Q3/Q4 of 2016, which is a tight timeframe.		Note circulated at meeting

<p>3.14</p> <p>3.15</p> <p>3.16</p>	<p>SC asked whether delivery of other housing sites in the area had fed into the figures. JC said that they had, and would circulate to SC. SHLAA figures would be required to be included as a further piece of work.</p> <p>JC explained that the SCC spatial strategy for secondary schools was to place it within the NF site as a preference. JC explained that IDP detail should be informed by the critical stages of delivery set out in the note.</p> <p>Action: JC to circulate list of school capacities, and development sites that have informed the note that was circulated.</p>	<p>JC</p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p>	<p>Discussion for TA submitted with CBRE / Mersea application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update from SCC on progress • Other comments received / issues arising from IBC • Comments from Crest / Ipswich School <p>DW said that SCC had not had any transport modelling before the application was submitted. He explained that the application TA was being considered by consultants on behalf of SCC. WSP for the modelling and AECOM for the TA. Results were due by the end of September.</p> <p>ID raised a number of queries regarding the CBRE/Mersea planning application, which are summarised as – 1.Queries about traffic modelling; 2.Scale of proposed highway improvements; 3. Whether the one way gyratory was in accordance with the SPD; 4. Whether the bus strategy achieves the relevant modal shift; and 5. Queries about the pedestrian and cycle connections through the site. These queries would be detailed in the Crest response to the application. JK explained Crest comments would formally be submitted at the end of Sept.</p> <p>In response AO explained that the application is not seeking approval for the gyratory layout, and that highway improvements would be based on capacity.</p> <p>RC commented that traffic issues are repeatedly raised in objections and have been highlighted as a concern by Mid Suffolk District Council. Feedback received from consultation, as well as the SPD sets out areas which need to be addressed. RC has raised particular areas of concern with DW and asked for them to be considered and included in his comments. These include: what the TA concludes on an IGS-wide strategy for improvements; whether the travel plan principles go far enough to encourage the levels of sustainable travel required; how the rail bridge has been considered in the TA; and the extent of the road network that has been considered in the application modelling.</p>		

5.0	General update on other IGS matters		
5.1	PW asked for an update on the SPD. RC explained that changes to the SPD had been agreed by the IBC Executive Committee, and is due to be presented at Full Council on 17 th September with recommendation that the amended version be used as interim guidance until formal adoption in 2015. Consultation on the draft Core Strategy is also proposed towards the end of this year / start of 2015, with the intention of a submission to the SoS around March 2015 for examination. This would be alongside CIL.		
6.0	Freedom of Information (FOI) - Minutes to not include any detail discussed that might prejudice the determination of the CBRE/Mersea planning application that is currently being considered by IBC.		
7.0	Any Other Business - None		
8.0	Date of Next Meeting - Wed 15 th October 10.30am		

The full minutes of this meeting are assumed to be accessible to the public and to staff, unless the chair claims an exemption under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000**. For detailed guidance about applying the exemptions visit <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>

 <p>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</p> <p>Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.</p> <p>Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.</p>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an “x” if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	
	3. Intended for future publication	x
	4. Related to criminal proceedings	
	5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	
	7. That could prejudice the conduct of public affairs	x
	8. Information that could endanger an individual’s health & safety	
	9. That is subject to legal privilege	
10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests		

	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
	12. Other Please describe	